

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

LAQUAN LEDBETTER, :
Plaintiff, :
v. : Case No. 3:03-cv-1999 (WWE)
TOWN OF EAST HARTFORD, et al., :
Defendants. :

RULING AND ORDER

The plaintiff, Laquan Ledbetter, brings this civil rights action challenging his conditions of confinement against the Town of East Hartford and various members of the East Hartford Police Department. The remaining defendants, Sergeants Connolly and Juergens ("the defendants"), have filed a motion for summary judgment.

Any represented party filing a motion for summary judgment against an unrepresented party must file and serve a Notice to Pro Se Litigant as a separate document. D. Conn. L. Civ. R. 56(b). The defendants have not complied with this rule. Thus, their motion is denied without prejudice.

The court notes, however, that documents sent to the plaintiff in November 2013 at the address on file were returned to the court as undeliverable. A check on the Department of Correction website reveals that the plaintiff no longer is incarcerated.

The plaintiff is required by local court rules to keep the court informed of an address at which he may be served with process. D. Conn. L. Civ. R. 83.1(c)2. As the plaintiff has not complied with the court rule, the case is dismissed without prejudice. The plaintiff may reopen this case only if he informs the court of his current address and demonstrates good cause for failure to comply with the court rules.

Accordingly, the defendants' motion for summary judgment [Doc. #59] is **DENIED** without prejudice. The case, however, is **DISMISSED** for the plaintiff's failure to comply with local court rules. Any motion to reopen judgment shall be filed within **thirty (30) days** from the date of this order. The Clerk is directed to enter judgment in favor of the defendants and close this case.

SO ORDERED this 6th day of February 2014, at Bridgeport, Connecticut.

/s/

Warren W. Eginton
Senior United States District Judge